

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11, and 12 remain in the application with claims 1, 3, and 11 having been amended hereby.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over *Shimizu, et al.* in view of *Tillin, et al.*

As explained in the present Specification, an exemplary embodiment of the present invention is intended to provide a reflective-transmissive liquid crystal display, having a specific construction as shown in cross-section in FIG. 11. As seen in FIG. 11, a quarter wave plate assembly is provided on either surface of the glass substrate surrounding the liquid crystal layer. The quarter wave plate assembly is formed of a half wave retardation film and a quarter wave retardation film. In that regard, a specific relationship is provided between the slow axis of the retardation films and the transmission axis of the respective polarizer. Such specific relationships are set forth in the equations $\Theta 2 = (2 \times \Theta 1) \pm 45$ degrees and $\Theta 3 = (2 \times \Theta 4) \pm 45$ degrees.

The claims have been amended hereby to emphasize the above-noted features of the present invention.

Shimizu, et al. relates to a liquid crystal display device and shows in FIG. 4 a multiple layer device in which phase difference plates are arranged between the polarizing plate and the liquid crystal layer.

The examiner notes that *Shimizu, et al.* fails to disclose the specific relationship between the two (2) slow axes of the retardation films as described above relative to claim 1 of the instant application.

Tillin, et al. is cited for disclosing a half wavelength retardation film and *Tillin, et al.* relates to a reflective type liquid crystal display. It is disclosed in *Tillin, et al.* that three retardation layers are provided with two fixed retardation layers and a variable retardation layer.

It is respectfully submitted that even viewing FIG. 27 of *Tillin, et al.* that the specific relationship between the two slow axes as taught by the present invention and as recited in the amended claims is not shown or suggested. Furthermore, the relationship relating to ± 45 degrees is not disclosed in *Tillin, et al.* The various values for the retardation films are set forth in tables 1 and 2 of *Tillin, et al.*, and it is respectfully submitted that the specific relationship as provided by the present invention is not disclosed therein.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that even combining the teaching relating to a reflective LCD device with the transmission reflective device of *Shimizu, et al.* that the present invention would not have been rendered obvious.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over *Shimizu, et al.* in view of *Tillin, et al.* and further in view of *Yoshimizu, et al.*

Claim 5 depends from claim 1 which, for the reasons set forth hereinabove, is thought to be patentably distinct over the cited references and, for at least those very same reasons, claim 5 is also submitted to be patentably distinct thereover.

In paragraph 4 of the instant Official Action, the Examiner notes that the relationship equations for both the reflective region and the transmission region were not recited in the rejected claims. Nevertheless, in view of the amendments made to the claims hereby, such relationship equation is now found explicitly in the claims.

Therefore, by reason of the amendments made to the claims hereby, as well as the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that a liquid crystal display, as taught by the present invention and as recited in the amended claims, is neither shown nor suggested in the cited references, alone or in combination.

Entry of this amendment is earnestly solicited and it is respectfully submitted that this Amendment raises no new issues requiring further consideration and/or search because the language used in the claims has simply been set forth more clearly.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC



Jay H. Maioli
Reg. No. 27,213
Attorney for Applicants

Dated: April 8, 2008

Mailing Address:

F. Chau & Associates, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, NY 11797
TEL.: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889